DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 748 CE 023 404

AUTHOR Blank, Rolf
TITLE Academic Credit for Work Experience in Maryland.
INSTITUTION Kirschner (E.J.) and Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Boards of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 79
CONTRACT DOL-99-8-1891-33-47
NOTE 71p.; Some pages in this document will not reproduce well due to faint and blurred type
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of State Boards of Education, 526 Hall of the States, 444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001 ($6.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Policy; Career Education; Case Studies; *Cooperative Programs; *Credits; Educational Coordination; Educational Policy; Experiential Learning; *Interagency Cooperation; Postsecondary Education; Prior Learning; Program Descriptions; School Districts; Secondary Education; State Action; State Standards; Vocational Education; *Work Experience; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Maryland; Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

The state of Maryland is the subject of this case study on the awarding of academic credit in local educational agency (LEA)-Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs. Three focuses of the report are descriptions of the existing LEA-CETA programs in Maryland that award academic credit and the related local policies and practices, the barriers to awarding credit for LEA-CETA programs, and identification of needed policies or actions at the state or local level that would facilitate awarding credit. The state-local relationship of CETA-LEA youth programs which are principally supported by funds designated under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) is discussed in terms of four of the five CETA prime sponsors. The methods used by these programs for awarding academic credit can be roughly divided into three basic categories: program evaluation for credit, credit for prior experience, and experience designed for credit. Following a summary of the issues in the awarding of academic credit and the barriers to program development and operation, local and state actions which have already been taken are presented. Further actions to improve design and delivery of services are suggested. The appendixes include assessment and evaluation materials and program outcomes data of the prime sponsor programs. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179748

ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE IN MARYLAND

Sponsored by:
National Association of State
Boards of Education

Prepared by:
Rolf Blank
Kirschner Associates

for

The Maryland CETA-Education Task Force

April 1979

Contents for this report were prepared pursuant to a contract with U.S. Department of Labor (99-8-1891-33-47).

The opinions expressed should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the U.S. Government.

CE023404

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PREFACE

The recently passed Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978 (CETA) emphasize communication between the employment and training community and the education community. The legislation recognizes a great need for the two groups to work toward joint planning and implementation of policies and programs especially in the area of employability, training and employment programs for youth.

Achieving these goals requires a concerted effort on the part of policy makers and program implementors who represent a variety of interest groups. The process of cooperation and change can be lengthy and complex, but can also create dramatic improvements in the preparation of youth and adults for the world of work.

The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), through a contract with the U.S. Department of Labor, has engaged in a project --"Barrier Identification and Strategy Delineation - A Collaborative Approach"-- to improve the effectiveness of CETA/YEDPA through increased collaboration between the education and labor communities. The project sponsored the following interrelated activities;

(i) worked with three states to address specific issues over which State Boards have jurisdictions and can provide leadership

a) academic credit for work experience and transition services - Maryland

b) administrative issues of CETA/education cooperation - Minnesota; and

c) coordination of education funded programs with CETA - YETP programs - Louisiana

(ii) developed resource guides in each of the three issues areas to respond to the specific state concerns, and provided assistance to other states working with these issues

(iii) developed complementary papers on the educational decision - making process and governance structure in the fifty states and the three project states. These are intended to assist education and employment and training staff in determining the governance structure in their state and the particular points where they can influence education decisions related to CETA-youth programs.

(iv) held a series of national meetings on CETA-education coordination including an" Education Roundtable" with the Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment for representatives from the project states to present their recommendations for changes in youth employment policies.

Two conferences were held in Washington, D.C.: the first one addressed CETA - Education coordination in terms of the CETA Amendments of 1978 while the second focused on specific policy and programmatic concerns related to coordination.

In each of the three project states, a task force was formed. These were comprised of state and local representatives from education and employment and training communities who identified specific problems in the issue area and developed plans to address those problems. This resulted in a resource guide being developed by each state which highlighted their particular concerns and recommended solutions. The Louisiana reports, CETA-Vocational Education Coordination, describes the evolution of CETA-Vocational Education informational advisory council to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education which occured as a result of the NASBE-sponsored task force activities. It also includes detailed information on the CETA and vocational education systems in terms of flow and use of these funds into and within the state. The extensive appendices in these areas would be informative on the use of federal and state CETA and vocational education funds.

The Maryland report, An Analysis of Academic Credit for Work Experience and Transition Services focuses on three aspects of academic credit. These are:

(i) descriptions of school-related CETA programs and credit awarding mechanisms in the state of Maryland,

(ii) the problems related to awarding credit, and

(iii) actions suggested at the state and local level to improve the current situation.

The descriptions and suggested approaches are of interest to local and states policy makers and practitioners.

Planning Together: A Guide for CETA and Education Program Planners, developed by the Minnesota task force, provides guidelines for establishing and administering cooperative youth work-experience programs. The general goal of the handbook is to encourage constructive shared decision-making and to indicate ways to increase the effective use of financial resources. The handbook addresses five aspects of joint planning:

(i) mutual understanding

(ii) process to facilitate joint planning

(iii) time schedules

(iv) budget, and

(v) formal agreements

Appendices include information on data forms, coding systems, sample budgets, agreements and worksheets.

Other complementary activities were the development of reports on CETA/education collaboration. Volume I, CETA - Education Collaboration in Three States, focuses on the collaborative activities and the educational governance structures in each of the project states. Organization charts and directories of key contacts in the education/employment and training communities are also included. Volume II, Educational Governance and Youth Employment Issues, outlines the overall education governance structure, delineating organizational relationships and responsibilities at state and local levels. It also contains an analysis of the decision-making structure in the following specific areas on a state-by-state basis: curriculum, guidance and counseling programs, secondary school graduation requirements and education personnel certification standards.

NASBE is grateful to the many members of the task forces in Louisiana, Maryland and Minnesota who contributed their time, information and expertise. Each of the states accepted a very difficult challenge by focussing on an issue area and then developing a publication in that area. Because, of their expertise and demonstrated coordination, we believe that their handbooks will be a value to policy makers and practitioners. The membership of the individual state task force is given in the publications developed by each of the states. The principal contract persons for each state were: Louisiana - James Soileau, Executive Director, Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and Michael Moon, Executive Director, Louisiana Vocational Education Advisory Council; Maryland - Richard Deasy, Director, Division of Instruction, Maryland Department of Education, Minnesota - Joyce Walker, Statewide CETA Coordination, Bureau of Economic Security and Joleen Durken, CETA-Education Coordinating Unit, Minnesota Department of Education.

The five reports generated in this project were developed under the guidance of the project director, Anne Radford Court. She was assisted by the research associate, Cathlene Williams. The overall project supervisor was Robert A. Berlam.

Wesley A. Apker
Executive Director
National Association of
State Boards of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	CETA-LEA Programs	2
	Purpose of Report On Academic Credit	3
II.	PROFILE OF STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIP IN MARYLAND	7
	State Policy on Academic Credit	8
	Other Requirements	10
III.	LOCAL PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT	12
	City Consortium Prime Sponsor	12
	County Prime Sponsor A	15
	County Prime Sponsor B	17
	Balance-of-State Prime Sponsor	19
IV.	MECHANISMS FOR AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT	21
	Program Evaluation for Credit	21
	Credit for Prior Experience	23
	Experiences Designed for Credit	23
V.	ISSUES AND BARRIERS RELATED TO AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT	25
	Issues in the Awarding of Academic Credit	25
	Barriers to Program Development and Operation	27
VI.	LOCAL ACTIONS	31
	Actions to Resolve Issues and Barriers	31
	Actions to Improve Design and Delivery	34
VII.	STATE ACTIONS	36

APPENDICES: Assessment and Evaluation Materials and Program Outcomes Data

A: City Consortium Programs

B: County A Program

C: County B Program

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit		Page
1	Issues and Barriers Related to Awarding Academic Credit; Local and State Actions Taken in Maryland	32

I

INTRODUCTION

The awarding of academic credit for nontraditional learning experiences in the public schools has been a topic of considerable interest and discussion among secondary school teachers, counselors, and administrators, and among members of boards of education at the State and local levels. In the last decade, educators have had to address the question of awarding academic credit for nontraditional types of courses in relation to the alternative school movement, as well as cooperative education and work-study programs. The passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CLTA) in 1973, and the subsequent amendments to the Act in the Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA), had the effect of increasing the interest of educators and noneducators in the question of awarding academic credit for nontraditional learning experiences. This is particularly true for planners and operators of employment and training programs.

CETA, and more specifically YEDPA, have made the issue of academic credit a concern of the planning councils, administrators, and staff of local prime sponsor organizations. Federal regulations for YEDPA direct CETA prime sponsors to attempt to provide academic credit for services offered to in-school and out-of-school youth under YEDPA:

> The Secretary of Labor. . . shall work with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make suitable arrangements with appropriate State and local education officials whereby academic credit may be awarded, consistent with applicable State law, by educational institutions and agencies for competencies derived from work experience obtained through programs established under this title.[1]

The promotion of academic credit for CETA-funded work experience and employment-related services, or transition services, has gained added significance due to the requirement that a proportion of funds available

---

[1] Public Law 95-93, Section 355 (b), effective August 5, 1977.

to each CETA prime sponsor be allocated for an in-school program that is operated through cooperative agreement with an LEA (local education agency).[2] Many prime sponsors had cooperative relationships with LEAs in their area prior to the Youth Amendments, but only a few had developed a written agreement with an LEA that sanctioned academic credit for work experience and other CETA-funded training and employment services.

CETA-LEA PROGRAMS

In many cases, the development of cooperative agreements between CETA prime sponsors and LEAs for the purpose of operating youth programs has been a difficult process. A number of explanations for barriers to establishing a working LEA-CETA relationship have been noted. These include mutual differences between CETA and schools in approach to education and job training, mutual misperceptions of purposes and methods, different funding cycles, and interest in serving different youth target groups.

The Office of Youth Programs of the Department of Labor/Employment and Training Administration has funded a project with the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) to collect information and develop reports on several topic areas related to LEA-CETA cooperation. The general purpose of the project is to understand the barriers to LEA-CETA cooperation and to develop knowledge about the processes of establishing sucessful relationships. One of the areas included in the NASBE project is the awarding of academic credit in LEA-CETA youth programs.

The NASBE project design specifies that a report on each topic area be developed with information from the LEA-CETA youth programs in one State. The purposes of the NASBE project include not only collecting

---

[2]Local education agency (LEA) meaning "a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control over, direction of, or service to public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or a combination of such school districts or counties which are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for their public elementary or secondary schools." (Federal Register, March 9, 1979; 97.702(h).)

and reporting information from LEA-CETA cooperative programs, but also showing the relationship of State education policies to local program policy and implementation. The State of Maryland was chosen as the site for the report on academic credit in LEA-CETA programs on the basis of three factors.

- There are a number of prime sponsors which have agreements with school districts in their areas that include the awarding of academic credit to CETA participants.
- The Maryland State Board of Education policy on graduation requirements and academic credit has had some effect on establishment of academic credit for LEA-CETA youth programs.
- The State Department of Education has had a role both in assisting the development of local school district policies on academic credit and the implementation of local programs.

Thus, the State of Maryland is the subject of the case study on the awarding of academic credit in LEA-CETA programs. The prime sponsors and LEAs in Maryland are the sites for collection of information on academic credit in LEA-CETA programs.

PURPOSE OF REPORT ON ACADEMIC CREDIT

The information in the report on academic credit will have three primary functions:

1) to describe the existing LEA-CETA programs in the State of Maryland that award academic credit and the related local policies and practices;

2) to outline the barriers to awarding credit for LEA-CETA programs; and

3) to identify needed policies or actions at the State or local level that would facilitate awarding academic credit for CETA-LEA programs.

The report is based on the assumption that there are a number of reasons why local school districts want to award academic credit for training and employment experiences provided through CETA, and likewise that CETA prime sponsors

want academic credit offered for these experiences and services. There are also likely to be reasons why LEAs and CETA organizations would not desire a cooperative relationship or academic credit for CETA participants. However, the contents of this report are designed to assist those LEAs and CETA organizations that have an interest in awarding academic credit to youth enrolled in a CETA-LEA program. The rationale for the report is that the experiences and recommendations of LEAs and prime sponsors may help improve LEA-CETA relationships in other States and local areas. This information may also help alleviate the problems associated with awarding academic credit for the learning experiences obtained in LEA-CETA youth programs.

In light of the basic rationale for this report, it may be useful to outline some of the reasons why local school districts have established academic credit for students that participate in CETA programs. Some of the primary reasons are:

- Awarding academic credit for CETA youth programs makes it possible for schools to retain high risk potential dropouts through offering an alternative method of learning and obtaining credits toward graduation.

- The school district can better serve the needs of disadvantaged students who often tend to have a combination of poor grades, low educational achievement, alienation from the public school system, and a high drop out rate.

- The school district can receive financial and staff support for expansion of existing education-work programs and thus provide services to more students through these programs.

- Through CETA, the school system has the opportunity to provide school dropouts with an alternative means of earning high school credits and possibly renewing their interest in education or training.

- Finally, CETA programs for youth allow the schools to develop a stronger linkage between the education curriculum and the job market. The use of CETA funds and the provision of academic credit for work experiences and transition services can help to bridge the school-work gap.

CETA prime sponsors have a slightly different set of reasons for wanting to have academic credit included in youth programs. Some of these are:

- A cooperative linkage with the public schools enables prime sponsor youth programs to have a stronger preventive focus and less of a rehabilitative orientation.
- Youth with problems in school or few career opportunities after high school can be offered a program that will provide the student with coping skills, basic academic skills, and/or job training.
- The dropout can be offered an alternative educational experience for credit before other types of problems related to dropping out necessitate a rehabilitative type of program. Youth can be provided services prior to entering the job market and before becoming part of an unemployment statistic.
- Awarding academic credit for work experience and transition services increases the legitimacy of the CETA youth program to the participant, the school district, and potential employers.
- Academic credit gives the school district a significant role in the operation of the program. This involvement may result in school faculty and staff taking a more active part in program development and in helping to integrate educational objectives into the design.
- For the CETA organization, awarding academic credit can be a means of expanding the types of skills that are inculcated through the program. It may expand the program's capability for developing attitudes that lead toward successful job-seeking, job-holding, and work performance.
- Implementation of academic credit in CETA youth programs helps fulfill one of the national purposes of the Youth Amendments by directly involving education agencies in the planning and operation of CETA youth programs and thus providing more comprehensive services to disadvantaged youth.

This report on the awarding of academic credit in LEA-CETA youth programs in the State of Maryland will include sections on the characteristics of local programs, the mechanisms used to award credit, barriers to awarding of academic credit, State and local actions to overcome the barriers, and recommendations based on the experience of the programs in Maryland. In order to provide a frame of

reference within which to view the role of academic credit in local LEA-CETA programs, the following chapter will sketch the State context in which these programs operate.

II

PROFILE OF STATE-LOCAL RELATIONSHIP IN MARYLAND

The CETA-LEA youth programs in Maryland are principally supported by funds designated under YEDPA. One purpose of YEDPA was to insure that prime sponsors would develop programs specifically designed to serve youth (aged 16-21). All CETA prime sponsors now have youth programs funded under Title IV of CETA (formerly Title III). Some of the youth programs in Maryland are also supported by CETA Title II funds. A second purpose of YEDPA was to encourage cooperative programs between CETA and public school districts. Each prime sponsor grant for Title IV includes funds designated for a Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). The YETP design must have an in-school program; at least 22 percent of YETP funds must be allocated to the youth program. Agreements can be made by the prime sponsor with more than one LEA, with an LEA for more than 22 percent of YETP funds, or with an LEA for operation of an out-of-school program. Title IV funds are also available to prime sponsors under competitive grants for Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project (YIEPP) or a Youth Community Conversation and Improvement Project (YCCIP).

There are five CETA prime sponsors within the State of Maryland. The prime sponsors consist of one city-counties consortium, two counties, one rural consortium, and one balance-of-state area. The State has 23 county school districts and the one city school district. Each school district is responsible for all public school activities in its jurisdiction.

The local CETA-LEA relationships will be briefly outlined here and further elaborated in the next section.

- One of the prime sponsors consists of a city and five surrounding counties, i.e., a consortium. This consortium prime sponsor has an agreement for YETP in-school and out-of-school programs with the city public school system. The prime sponsor also has agreements for in-school programs with two of the county school districts and for an out-of-school program with another county school district. The consortium is the recipient of a large YIEPP grant that is operated with the city school system. All of the programs operated with LEAs include provision for academic credit.

- Two of the prime sponsors in the State are county governments. Both counties have rural areas and populous suburban areas which are contiguous with a major urban center. Each of the prime sponsors has an agreement with the county board of education for operation of a YETP in-school program. Both school districts award academic credit to YETP participants.

- The balance-of-state prime sponsor is comprised of 12 rural counties. The prime sponsor has agreements with 6 of the county boards of education for operation of in-school programs. Each of the 6 programs has some type of academic credit awarded to participants.

- A 4-county prime sponsor consortium in a rural portion of the State operates youth programs with the counties' public schools, but academic credit is not currently awarded to participants. Plans are being made for a consortium-wide program that would provide credit through cooperation of the four school systems and a prime sponsor-funded service center that would administer programs in the four counties. This prime sponsor area was not included in the data collection process for this report and the programs that it administers will not be described in the following sections.

The CETA-LEA relationships have been encouraged and reinforced by the visible working relationships which exist between the State Department of Education and the State Manpower Planning Office. For example, in October 1977 these two organizations planned and sponsored a state-wide meeting of LEA, prime sponsor, and state agency representatives for the purpose of discussing the youth employment legislation and ways of cooperatively carrying it out. Other examples of cooperation are detailed in the section on State Actions beginning on page 36.

STATE POLICY ON ACADEMIC CREDIT

The State Board of Education's policy statement, "The Mission of Schooling," describes the basic educational program in terms of five areas: basic skills, world of work, world of leisure time, world of citizenship, and survival skills. Preparation for the world of work is generally

described in this policy statement as (a) acquisition of a salable skill and assistance in securing employment upon graduation for all who wish it, and (b) awareness by all students of the options and opportunities in the world of work without racial and sexual bias. The State Board of Education has specified competencies in each of the five areas which will be required for graduation after 1983.

The Maryland State Board of Education sets graduation requirements for all public high schools in the State. The Board of Education, which is an elected body, must approve all credits that are awarded by a local school system to count toward a high school diploma. According to State law, the local school boards award credit for graduation, but the course for credit must meet the minimum standards of the State Board of Education.[1] Local school boards may set their own course of instruction or method of awarding credit for graduation if it meets the minimum standards of the State. Under the definition of an LEA by CETA regulations, the 23 county school boards and the city school board are the only LEAs with which CETA prime sponsors could arrange programs with academic credit.

The State requires a minimum of 20 credits for graduation. At least 11 credits must be in specific subject areas, e.g., mathematics, English, science, history; an additional 9 credits may be electives. Work study programs or experiences outside the school can count toward elective credits for graduation if approved by the local school board and supervised by the local school system. The State policy statement on work study reads as follows:

---

[1]The Public School Laws of Maryland, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, MD, September 1977.

> Work and experience outside the school are recognized as valid ways of learning. Time spent in such activities may be counted as a portion of the specified number of clock hours required for credit when identified as an integrated part of a planned program. No more than nine credits may be granted to a student for work or experience outside the school approved and supervised by the local school system.[2]

The state policy includes alternatives to four-year enrollment through the Accelerated Twenty-Credit Program, Early College Admissions Program, Early Admission to an Approved Vocational, Technical, or other Post-Secondary School, Job Entry Training Program, or the General Educational Development Testing Program (GED).

There are two other basic options for earning a high school diploma under the State policy: 1) a curriculum design which includes learning in seven broad categories of human concerns that are not defined by discipline, e.g., people as physical beings, people as thinkers, people and survival, etc., and 2) personalized programs that are designed to meet the needs of the student. A deploma is awarded to students who successfully complete the approved personalized program of studies. Alternative programs for graduation must meet the approval of the local school board, the State Superintendent, and the State Board of Education.

Under Maryland State law and State graduation requirements, a participant in a CETA-LEA program that includes work experience and/or employability (transition) services that improve employability can be awarded credit for graduation as one of the 20-credit requirements, or under one of the two options for alternative programs for graduation. However, the program must first meet the standards of the local school system and the local and State school boards.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

There are other laws and regulations that affect the awarding of academic credit for experiences or services under CETA. The program

---

[2] Graduation Requirements for Public High Schools in Maryland, Maryland State Department of Education, November 1974.

design must meet CETA regulations and participants must meet the eligibility criteria for each specific program. For example, program operators may need to provide evidence that a disadvantaged participant's family income is below 85 percent of the lower living standard as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. CETA or LEA program administrators must insure that work experiences under YETP are accompanied by a minimum set of transition services that assist youth in obtaining unsubsidized employment following completion of the program. There are a number of other specific regulations that the CETA prime sponsor as administrator and the LEA as program operator must follow for the program to be approved at Regional and National DOL/ETA offices. The Regional DOL/ETA office must approve all grant plans, contracts, and agreements. However, in general CETA regulations do encourage the awarding of academic credit and there is not a specific policy related to approval at DOL/ETA.

Federal and State child labor laws set a maximum of 15 hours work per week for work experience program (part-time work). Laws governing vocational exploration programs (allowed under YEDPA) specify that the work experience must be training and that the pay be a training allowance rather than a wage. Certain types of work cannot be done and training sites must be rotated.

Each of the Maryland prime sponsor/LEA programs outlined above meets State and local requirements for academic credit slightly differently. In order to provide an understanding of the interaction between CETA and LEA, the design and methods of awarding of academic credit in each program will be briefly described. A summary section on the methods of awarding credit in Maryland will follow the individual program descriptions.

III

LOCAL PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT

CITY CONSORTIUM PRIME SPONSOR

The programs operated by the city consortium prime sponsor in conjunction with the city school systems serve a large majority of the youth who are awarded academic credit through Maryland LEA-CETA programs. The various youth program models are designed to serve school dropouts or potential dropouts, as well as students needing employment and training services.

The CETA-LEA programs for youth within the city are directed toward decreasing the high drop out rate from public schools (approximately 12,000 students per year) and the high youth unemployment rate. Cooperation between the CETA prime sponsor and the city public school system began in 1972 when the Mayor made a decision to use CETA funds to create an alternative high school for school dropouts. From this beginning, the program has been expanded through the use of YEDPA funds. The city consortium and the public schools now cooperatively offer a number of programs that serve in-school and out-of-school youth and provide academic credit for employment and training experiences.

Applicants for youth programs go through intake and assessment at the Youth Manpower Service Center, or, for in-school youth, at their school. All applicants must be economically disadvantaged and between the ages of 16 and 21 (16 to 19 for the Entitlement program). The assessment process includes reading and aptitude tests and interviews with counselors.

Youth who are currently enrolled in a junior or senior high school in the Entitlement target area (central city enlarged), and are potential dropouts or desire a part-time job, may be placed in the Entitlement program. The purpose of the Entitlement program is to determine the effect of a guaranteed part-time job on school retention. The 55 participating junior and senior high schools were responsible for screening of students for the approximately 7,000 slots.

In-school Entitlement Program

The Entitlement program is paid work experience with a public or private employer for 10-15 hours per week. The student must remain in school and work out a schedule with a school counselor for release time during the school day or work after school. CETA job counselors attempt to match the aptitude and interests of the student with a job and an employer. The prime sponsor is currently in the process of hiring 30 school coordinators who will serve as a liaison to local schools, recruit students, monitor participants' job performance, provide some transition services, and refer students to CETA centers for further services prior to termination from the program.

One-half credit is awarded for a minimum of 132 hours successful work per semester. Assessment of the work experience is provided through an Employee Progress Report (EPR) which is completed by the work supervisor prior to the end of each semester. Student-employees are rated on a scale of 1 to 5 for 13 categories of performance on the job (see Appendix A for a copy of the EPR). To receive one-half credit for the semester, a student-employee must obtain a 2.5 average for the EPR. The school system must certify that the student maintains an overall academic average of 60 in his/her academic courses. An 80 percent attendance rate in school and at work must be maintained for the participant to remain in the program. The participant may earn one work-study credit per year through the program. The credit counts as an elective toward graduation (there is a maximum of seven electives in the city schools). The prime sponsor informs each school of students' eligibility for credit and the school assigns a letter grade based on the EPR average and number of hours worked.

Alternative programs for dropouts

Youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have dropped out of school and apply for CETA assistance can be placed in alternative educational programs. Applicants who read below the fifth grade level (which includes about 40 percent of dropouts applying to CETA) can be placed in functional literacy programs or alternative education centers. An alternative program for over-aged, poor achievers with behavior problems is operated by the prime sponsor with the public school system.

The prime sponsor and the public schools jointly operate two programs for dropouts who read between the fifth and eighth grade levels. Both of these programs award academic credit toward graduation. One program consists of an alternative high school funded by CETA and staffed by public school teachers that serves approximately 400 dropouts. The students are assigned to one of five occupational clusters or to a one-year EBCE program. Five required credits in English, mathematics, science, social science, and reading can be earned, plus four elective credits for a vocational exploration course and work experience. A total of nine credits can be earned in the school year which runs from September to August on a trimester basis. Students in the clusters program attend classes full-time for two weeks and then work at a job in their occupational area for two weeks. Credit is awarded for work experience using the EPR method of assessment described above.

Students in the EBCE program are provided individualized instruction for the required academic credits and for the work experience component. Participants work part-time throughout the year and receive four elective credits for work experience if they successfully complete seven projects. The projects are designed by the EBCE teacher with the student to reinforce the learning objectives of the work experience. The project design also serves as a means of assessing the learning experiences gained through work. (See Appendix A for the project format.) Employer supervisors used in the program are made aware of the project system prior to assignment of the youth to the work site. The supervisor is expected to help the student accomplish the project objectives. The LAPS method (Learning Activities Packets) is used to provide individualized instruction for the five required credits. The LAPS is a competency-based curriculum that allows students to progress at their own pace and to obtain required academic credits while in a work experience position.

The alternative school programs are funded under YETP. During fiscal year 1978, a total of 2,768 participants were in a YETP program of the city consortium (city and county schools). Of the total enrollees, 1,142 received some academic credit (41 percent) and the retention rate for all programs was 73 percent.

A second program jointly operated by the city public schools and the prime sponsor is an "extended day" program. The participants in this program are

generally older dropouts. They are assigned to a public or private employer for work in the mornings and attend occupational and basic skills classes in the public vocational schools following the normal school day. Public school facilities are put to greater use through this CETA program. Dropouts are drawn back to school by the opportunity to receive vocational skills training. Classes are taught by public school teachers who are paid an additional salary through CETA funds. The 600 youth in this program are dropouts who have demonstrated aptitudes for an occupation and read above the fifth grade level. The normal school grading and credit awarding procedures are used in the skills classes.

COUNTY PRIME SPONSOR A

One of the Maryland county prime sponsors has an agreement with the county public schools for cooperative administration of an in-school program that is funded by YETP and Title II B. The program is operated through county schools by public school staff. Four senior and three junior high schools are the primary locations for the in-class component, but students are drawn from 70 schools, and special education centers provide work experience or transition services. Currently, approximately 550 students, grades nine through twelve, are participating. The program includes a combination of a career employment experience class (senior high schools) or career exploration and assessment (junior high schools), and paid work experience. Academic credit is awarded for participation in the ninth, eleventh, and twelfth grade components of the program.

The program was designed through cooperative efforts of CETA and career education staff. The public schools' strong career and vocational education curriculum had a significant effect on the overall program design. The basic purpose of the program is to identify potential dropouts among the disadvantaged student population prior to and during the ninth grade and provide services to keep these students in school. In the eleventh and twelfth grades, services are designed to improve academic skills, coping skills, and vocational skills in order to prepare high school students for the job market or further training or education. The experience of program staff and the identified needs of youth indicate that students in risk of dropping out need to be assisted by the ninth grade. By the end of the ninth grade, many students can legally drop out of school.

The ninth grade program evolved from an LEA effort that was operated prior to YETP funding with CETA Title I funds. The success of the previous effort was an important factor in expanding the program through YETP. (See Appendix B for data on the previous program participants.) Participants are selected for the ninth grade program through referral by teachers and counselors, application, and determination of need. Most participants are drawn from schools with a high percentage of disadvantaged students. The current ninth grade program consists of a one-hour-per-day career exploration and student assessment class for which students receive social studies credit. Participants can work up to two hours per day with one-half credit awarded for each hour of work experience. Since most work sites for the ninth graders are within the school system (e.g.,teacher aides, laboratory assistant, etc.), the credit counts as a "student assistant" elective. The career exploration teachers supervise and monitor the work experience of students in their classes.

Tenth grade students in County A public schools can be given release time from school for paid work experience, but no credit is awarded. The tenth grade curriculum is heavy with required classes, so no CETA-funded classes are offered. The eleventh grade program is designed to provide employability skills training. Approximately one-half of the eleventh grade YETP participants have been through the ninth grade program. In the four high schools where the eleventh grade program is currently operating, participants take a career employment experience course one hour per day and are assigned to a work site for two hours per day. Students obtain one distributive education credit for career employment experience and two work-study credits are awarded for the work experience. Participants are placed in public or private nonprofit sector job sites (about one-half are public sector and one-half private) by the teacher/coordinator with the assistance of CETA staff. Assignment to job sites is based on results of students' vocational interest and aptitude assessment.[1] Prior to assignment of students to a job, the YETP staff analyze the job site and the employer supervisor. (See Appendix B for evaluation and job site assessment instruments.)

---

[1]Assessment is partly accomplished with the VIESA (Vocational, Interest, Experience, and Skill Assessment) instrument published by the American College Testing Program.

The ninth and eleventh grade programs were designed by CETA and LEA staff. The designs are similar to the RBS (Research for Better Schools) model for EBCE, i.e., modified EBCE. The model provides for integration of work experience with the career and job exploration objectives of an in-class curriculum. The YETP staff (composed of school and CETA personnel) are currently redesigning the ninth and eleventh grade program to include less time in public sector work experience than at present. The new design provides one semester of public sector experience and one semester private sector job experience. Program staff have found that academic credit for work experience does help students to stay in school and to graduate, but that a diploma, per se, does not assure readiness for the job market. The program changes are geared toward greater student employability.

Currently, twelfth grade students can participate in paid work experience after school, for which credit is awarded. A skills training is also offered on Saturdays, but no credit is awarded. To improve transition services for seniors, a program is being developed that will assist students to define career goals, assess job opportunities, and outline training and employment plans prior to and following graduation.

COUNTY PRIME SPONSOR B

County B's public school system has less of a problem with high drop out rates than other State school systems, but it does have a high proportion of high school graduates who have no career plans and few job opportunities. In recognition of this situation, the CETA prime sponsor has allocated all of its YETP funds to an in-school program operated through the county high schools. The one-year program is designed to provide career exploration, job seeking skills, and occupational training to disadvantaged students whose vocational and career development needs are not met in the regular school curriculum.

The YETP program has three separate courses, each of which has been approved as part of the LEA curriculum. The courses--career awareness, prevocational assessment, and in-class vocational or on-the-job training--are offered consecutively during the three quarters of the regular school year (September to June). The career awareness course was a part of the LEA curriculum prior to YETP. The occupational skills training courses (in-class and OJT) were modeled after

the regular vocational training and work-study programs. The prevocational assessment course was designed for the YETP program and has been given tentative approval by the school board.

The support of the program by the local education establishment--the school board and county high schools--is partly due to the role of the project director, who is also director of vocational and career education. The director was able to develop a program design acceptable to CETA and simultaneously gain the support of the school system. The fact that all components of the program were already a part of the regular high school curriculum also aided in gaining approval. Thus, academic credit could be awarded without the creation of a special rule or policy for the program.

Participants in the in-school program are drawn from the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades of the 12 high schools with the highest percentage of disadvantaged students. Program applicants were identified from the CETA summer jobs program and the school free lunch program. All participants are administered the GATB test to determine vocational aptitudes, as well as a series of other tests and interviews to define needs and interests. The program courses are conducted in the public schools after the completion of the regular school day. Participants are paid a stipend of $2.90 an hour for their time in the program. They receive two hours of instruction a day for the first two courses (seven weeks each), and one-half elective credit is awarded for each of these upon successful completion. The skills training is for 14 weeks (March to June) and the student can receive one academic credit. Students must sucessfully complete one component of the program before registering for the next. This year the program enrolled 133 students; 85 students remained in the third quarter.[1]

The in-class component of the program is taught by regular teachers who are paid an additional salary for the extra classes. Counselors ("vocational advocates") are responsible for awarding on-the-job training credit through consultation with the students' employer supervisor. The OJT contracts specify

---

[1] Data on participants in the initial program in summer 1978 are shown in Appendix C.

that the employer will hire participants on a part-time basis following completion of the program.

The vocational advocates are hired by the school system and paid with YETP funds. They assist in initial assessment and interviewing of applicants, counseling of participants, and monitoring of employers and students in the OJT component. CETA youth staff are primarily responsible for program monitoring and evaluation of participant performance. CETA staff also provide labor market information while students are enrolled and will assist participants in finding unsubsidized jobs or summer employment following completion of the program.

BALANCE-OF-STATE PRIME SPONSOR

Among the 12 county school systems within the balance-of-state area, there are currently six YETP in-school programs in which participants receive some type of academic credit. Each of the county school boards must approve the use of YETP funds in their county. The program design offered by CETA has generally been adapted to what is currently found in the schools and the type of program that is acceptable to the local school board.

In each of the six counties, work experience is offered in conjunction with transition services provided in the schools. In two counties a survival course which provides functional job skills and literacy training is offered for credit (one-quarter credit in one county and one-half credit in the other). A job shadowing program with private industry is also offered, but it does not include credit or a wage. The other four counties with programs have paid work experience slots and transition services for credit. Two of the programs were designed from the work-study model and can award up to three or four credits per year to a participant. The awarding of academic credit in these two programs was facilitated by the prior approval of work-study credit in the system. One county school system that has not awarded academic credit previously has recently approved an accredited EBCE program for next year.

Each county program has at least a part-time program coordinator who is paid with YETP funds. Work sites are developed by the local program coordinator. The prime sponsor requires that work sites be career-related.

A contract has recently been awarded by the prime sponsor to the State Department of Education to implement a vocational guidance program in each of the twelve counties of the balance-of-state area. This program will be supported through the prime sponsor's YETP funds. The program design includes funds for a State Department of Education vocational guidance supervisor who will assist the schools in hiring a vocational counselor in each county. The vocational counselor will coordinate YETP in-school programs and serve as a liaison person to the schools and the community. Through administration of the project by the State Department of Education, YETP services will be expanded to additional school systems and to disadvantaged students in more areas. The project has the potential for assisting more schools in awarding academic credit for YETP and developing a wider range of training and employment services for in-school youth.

IV

MECHANISMS FOR AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT

The Office of Youth Programs, Department of Labor/ETA, has suggested that there are three basic ways in which academic credit is awarded for work experience and related services:

1) Program evaluation for credit
2) Credit for prior experience
3) Experience designed for credit.

These three models are described in a DOL/ETA publication designed to assist program operators who are considering development of a YEDPA program that offers academic credit to participants.[1] The models also can be used to examine the types of program designs that currently provide academic credit and the mechanisms by which the credit is awarded.

The methods for awarding credit to participants in the Maryland LEA-CETA programs can be roughly divided into these three categories. Because there are variations in the actual methods of awarding academic credit within each category, and in some cases categories may overlap, the models will be used in this report to summarize the means of awarding of academic credit in the State. These categories do not exactly depict the mechanisms for awarding credit.

PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR CREDIT

In this method of awarding credit, program staff assess the learning opportunities a participant is likely to receive in a particular job site or from a set of experiences. The potential for the total experience is considered and credit is then awarded based on a predetermined amount of time in that experience.

---

[1] The Awarding of Academic Credit Under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, U.S. Department of Labor/ETA, Office of Youth Programs, November, 1977.

The program evaluation for credit method is used in the Entitlement program and the work experience component of the occupational clusters program in the city public schools. A rating of student performance on the job is completed by the employer supervisor, but the rating is for general criteria of work performance, e.g., attitudes, demeanor, attendance, etc., not for any specific job skills or competencies. The work experience is presumed to be worthy of credit based on the staff analysis of the job and work site.

The program evaluation method is also used in the two county programs and the balance-of-state, but the methods vary across these programs. In the County A in-school program, teacher-coordinators regularly monitor the work experience and interact with the work supervisor. The role of the teacher-coordinator allows for a grade to be assigned for each credit and provides for assessment of the value of the experience in terms of the individualized plan for each participant. Thus, the work experience of each participant can be coordinated with the objectives of the overall program and the classroom experiences.

In the County B in-school program, the "program evaluation model" is found in the awarding of credit only in the on-the-job training component. For credit in OJT, participants must demonstrate to the employer and the "vocational advocate" (school monitor/counselor) that they have accomplished the objectives of the training contract, including the required number of hours. To some extent, performance standards are established and there is assessment of their achievement by the monitor, but the nature of an OJT contract places the burden of the evaluation on the initial development of the position. (See Appendix B for a copy of an OJT contract.)

The balance-of-state programs that award academic credit for work experience are based on work-study models. Separate grades are given for the work experience and classroom portions of the program. The work experience component is designed to augment the classroom learning. The amount of time in a work situation is the primary means of assessment and awarding of credit.

CREDIT FOR PRIOR EXPERIENCE

The State of Maryland recognizes the General Educational Development Test as a valid means of earning a high school diploma. The GED is available through the city consortium prime sponsor, out-of-school programs, and it is probably also available through other prime sponsors' programs. However, none of the LEAs that cooperate with CETA for youth programs prepare students for the GED. The city consortium prime sponsor has found that school dropouts that are served have little chance of passing the GED. A high percentage of dropouts who are CETA participants need remedial training in basic skills before they could enter a high school curriculum. An "external degree" program, which provides credit for prior experience, has recently been developed by the State Department of Education.

EXPERIENCES DESIGNED FOR CREDIT

The city public schools-prime sponsor alternative high school, county A's career exploration and work orientation program, and county B's school-based program all have experiences designed for credit.

The occupational clusters program of the alternative high school is partially an experience designed for credit. The instruction for required credits is structured to take advantage of student motivation for learning that is gained from the work experience. The vocational exploration class is designed for credit since the instruction is coordinated with the work experiences of students. The work experience is evaluated primarily on the basis of time on the job and the satisfactory fulfillment of job requirements. To the extent that the job is related to classroom instruction, it is a part of the overall learning experience of the program, but the actual awarding of credit for work is accomplished by the program evaluation method.

The EBCE program in the alternative high school fits the "experiences designed for credit" model. Each component of the program is competency-based. The in-class component and work experiences are designed for evaluation of learning skills and competencies, and for awarding credit on the basis of evaluation. The work experience in this model is evaluated on an individual basis, i.e., according to the teacher and student-defined learning objectives that are established prior to the start of the work experience.

The classroom components of the two county in-school programs are experiences designed for credit in that the parts of the program were planned by program staff and the curricula are largely competency-based. However, the in-class components of the programs are graded separately and use different methods of evaluation from the work experience components. The County A program work experience component is a separate course with different objectives from the classroom component. Students from the in-class component are placed in work experience positions and supervised by the program teacher. The program fits the modified EBCE model. One course in the County B plan was designed specifically for the CETA program, but it is strictly an in-class activity. There is not a work experience component to which all participants are assigned and for which academic credit is awarded.

V

ISSUES AND BARRIERS RELATED TO AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT

A number of issues in the awarding of academic credit for work experience and transition services in CETA-LEA programs were raised in the course of data collection. Specific barriers to program development and implementation were also identified by CETA and LEA respondents. Resolving these issues and overcoming the barriers have been crucial to securing the approval of the local schools and implementing the program. The issues and barriers listed below are those common to at least two programs from which data were collected.

ISSUES IN THE AWARDING OF ACADEMIC CREDIT

Lack of Communication Between LEA and CETA

All of the prime sponsors and LEAs from which information was collected have experienced some problems in developing the policy on local academic credit due to misunderstanding of the role and objectives of the other organization. Communication between administrators and staff of the LEA and prime sponsor typically began due to the CETA regulation requiring that an agreement for the program be developed. Staff found that a forced relationship based on decisions by local governments or CETA regulations did not lead to the level of cooperation necessary to develop a program with academic credit.

In gaining approval for academic credit, it was necessary for the school board to fully understand the purposes and design of the program. The board needed to be familiarized with the CETA youth programs and the respective roles of the CETA organization and the school system in meeting objectives. To implement the program with academic credit, program staff from the LEA and CETA needed to develop open channels of communication and to reach a mutual level of understanding and trust in the purposes and interests of the other organization.

Faulty School System Perceptions of the Program

The school system's approval for award of academic credit is more easily obtained when education officials and staff perceive the youth program as a school program funded through CETA, rather than as a CETA program operated through the schools. Some resentment was expressed by school officials in one system when they found that the program had been planned by CETA, and that the schools would only be the vehicle for awarding credit. In this instance the LEA found that there were differences with CETA on the number of hours necessary to obtain credit for work experience. In one of the counties, the program was funded by CETA on the basis of a response of the LEA to an RFP. In that case, the program was clearly a school program from the start and the process of gaining school system support was not a difficult one. Lack of LEA involvement early in program design and development can be a large barrier to approval of academic credit.

Difference Between the CETA Funding Cycle and the School Year

The timing of the allocation of CETA grants by the Department of Labor has made it difficult to plan for program staff and services in a number of Maryland programs. In some of the sites, students could not be scheduled for the CETA-LEA program until funding was assured. This resulted in a delay of the program start and disruption of the academic year. Some school systems are reluctant to accept federal support in general due to the complications of timing of funding and the temporary nature of federal funds.

Questions With Regard to the Educational Value of Work Experience

The value of work per se as a learning experience has been questioned by both LEAs and prime sponsors. The structure of the work experience is highly related to its acceptability. Programs that are designed with a work experience component which is offered to students in conjunction with an in-class component tend to receive greater support and are approved more easily. In those school systems that have an established work-study program with academic credit, the adaptation of the work-study model to

the CETA-LEA program generally facilitated the approval process. LEA staff in the city consortium program expressed some dissatisfaction at the degree of school staff supervision received by CETA participants. Regular LEA work-study and guidance staff have not been able to provide sufficient assistance to the CETA work experience participants. The supervision of work experience and legitimization of academic credit are issues in each of the programs.

Some school systems have structured the CETA program to minimize the work experience component. The systems in the balance-of-state and city consortium areas that lack an in-school program with academic credit have been opposed to work-for-credit on the basis of the questionable educational value of work experience.

The potential conflict between paid work experience and awarding of academic credit was not identified by LEA and CETA staff as an ongoing problem or as a major barrier to approval of credit. The school systems tend to view a wage or allowance as a means of keeping students in school. This is a valuable tool in the city schools and County A schools which have high dropout rates. City schools and County A and B schools have had work-study and cooperative education programs in which students have received a wage for work experience. This precedent makes pay for CETA work experience less of an issue.

Need for Additional State Assistance

Approval of credit for CETA-LEA programs in at least one prime sponsor area is hampered by lack of information from the State on the type of program that would be acceptable for credit. This is a problem for school systems that are less familiar with CETA and less experienced in operating work-study programs.

BARRIERS TO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION

Scheduling of Student Participants

A barrier to program design and implementation that has been common to all of the programs is the timing of CETA funding, which conflicts

with the school year and the planning of student schedules. In fiscal year 1979, programs were not implemented until CETA funds were received in November. At several of the sites student schedules had to be re-arranged to place them in the program. Thus, a number of students who were interested in receiving credit through the program may not have been able to enter. This problem may be partially alleviated in one program by scheduling students in the spring for fall classes.

Limited Number and Quality of Community Job Sites

All of the programs have attempted to involve the private sector in providing work experience job sites. The total number of job sites in the public and private sectors is a problem in some areas. It is a particular problem in urban areas because of the number of other work-study programs (CETA and non-CETA). In the balance-of-state area there is a shortage of job sites.

To some extent, the development of appropriate slots will be constrained by the number of work sites and employer supervisors that will provide a learning experience for participants. In those programs in which staff attempt to do a task analysis of each potential position and interview the work supervisor to insure that students are matched with a position that will meet their interests and needs, the process of placing students can be difficult and time consuming. However, these programs are also likely to be ones for which the validity of awarding academic credit for work experience will be most assured.

Logistics of Program Delivery

Transportation of program participants from their schools to work sites or from their regular school to the school where the CETA youth program is being provided is a continuous problem over all of the State. This is due to the large number of junior and senior high schools from which students are drawn for the program. The logistical problem touches upon the issue of academic credit since the schools must record the number of hours worked and the grade or assessment of work experience given by the coordinator/monitor. A major problem of merging CETA and school records, which are on separate computer systems, also exists in the city schools.

Supervision of Work Sites

State and local policies require school staff to supervise any activities for which academic credit is awarded. The definition of "supervision" is a problem that has be resolved in each program. The degree of supervision and whether the supervision must be by a licensed teacher are typical questions that are raised in most LEA-CETA program negotiations.

Coordination of Program Staff

Each of the Maryland programs has staff specifically assigned to the CETA-LEA effort and paid through CETA funds. A problem has arisen in one program due to the fact that in-school staff are hired by the school system and paid on the same schedule, but they do not obtain tenure. For this reason, as well as the perceived temporary status of CETA funding, it is difficult to retain program staff. In the city program, staff may be hired by both CETA and the LEA. As a result, personnel working together may be paid on very different salary schedules. In addition, coordination problems have arisen centering around whether staff report to the school principal or the CETA program supervisor. Appropriate assignment of staff to departments has also been an issue for some programs.

A related problem involves staffing and program operations over the summer. A number of the program coordinators mentioned that it would be advantageous to operate the program year-round, and thus give a greater number of students an opportunity to earn academic credit. However, it has been difficult to obtain school personnel that could be hired for the summer and some of the systems have not been eager to extend the program over vacation. Many of the participants in the program can enter the CETA summer program, but they do not receive academic credit for summer work experience.

Academic Deficits of Applicants

In all of the CETA-LEA programs from which information was collected, applicants who have low basic skills (reading, writing, math) were the most difficult to place in the program. Appropriate positions for these individuals are limited and these participants typically have difficulty with the in-class portion of the program. Various approaches have been taken to alleviate this problem. The alternative high school emphasizes improvement of basic skills. The city consortium has implemented a number of functional literacy and basic skills programs. These have met with some success. However, applicants to CETA cannot be transferred out of the traditional schools even if they have low basic skills. Participants in nonschool basic skills classes funded by CETA do not receive academic credit for their accomplishments. Other prime sponsor-LEA programs have attempted to meet the need for basic skills training through the programs' in-class activities. Many of the participants could use additional courses or assistance to improve basic academic skills, but the limitation of funding or scheduling has apparently prevented implementation.

VI

LOCAL ACTIONS

ACTIONS TO RESOLVE ISSUES AND BARRIERS

Local program administrators have taken several types of actions to resolve the issues and overcome the barriers described in the previous section. Since approaches vary somewhat over local programs, specific examples in each category will be cited. A number of LEA and CETA staff that were interviewed emphasized that programs should seek to devise local methods of resolving issues such as the awarding of academic credit. The actions taken in the local programs in Maryland may be of assistance to others in Maryland and across the country as models for solving similar problems. A summary of the issues and barriers, and of the local and state actions taken in the Maryland programs, is shown in Exhibit 1. A description of local actions follows below.

CETA/LEA Liaison

Each of the sites in Maryland has had some degree of success in establishing a liaison person, or persons, to act as an intermediary between CETA and the school system. In some locations the liaison is a formal role that has been established as part of the youth programs, while in other areas a program staff person has informally taken over the necessary job of interpreting the intentions, plans, and goals of one organization to the other. In one program, a former local school board member is an official liaison between the county prime sponsor and the school board. The approval of academic credit has particularly benefited by the activities of the liaison in this area.

In two other prime sponsor areas, persons within the LEA and/or CETA staff have taken on the reponsibilities of liaison. A youth planner in CETA and an assistant superintendent of schools in two districts have been able to ease the many day-to-day problems of program implementation because of their positions of authority in each of their respective organizations. The liaison roles have also helped to develop the overall

EXHIBIT 1

ISSUES AND BARRIERS RELATED TO
AWARDING ACADEMIC CREDIT; LOCAL AND
STATE ACTIONS TAKEN IN MARYLAND

Issues	Actions
1. Lack of Communication between LEA and CETA	1. - Liaison between LEA and CETA - Frequent meetings of program administrators - Support of local government
2. Perception by Schools of a "CETA" program	2. - In-service meetings with school faculty - Involvement of LEA and CETA in hiring staff - State education assistance
3. Difference between CETA funding cycle and school year	3. - Liaison between LEA and CETA - Frequent meetings - Carryover funds
4. Questions of value of work experience	4. - Adapting alternative education models to local needs - Liaison between program and community
5. Need for additional assistance from State department of education	5. - Subcontract to State department to establish vocational counselors as local CETA-LEA liaisons - State-wide meetings of prime sponsors and schools - CETA program assistance team in State department
Barriers	**Actions**
1. Scheduling of participants	1. - Program planning and student scheduling in spring for fall start-up - Carrying over CETA funds to next school year
2. Limited number and quality of work sites	2. - Liaison between program and community - Relationship of CETA and LEA to public sector, private industry organizations, and unions - Support from local government
3. Logistics of program delivery	3. - Reducing number of school sites for the program - Hiring staff person to coordinate program in each school site
4. Supervision of work sites	4. - Involvement of CETA and LEA in hiring staff - Frequent meetings of program administrators - LEA-employed program staff
5. Coordination of staff	5. - In-service meetings - Frequent administrator meetings - Liaison between LEA and CETA
6. Lack of basic skills	6. - Alternative curriculums and schools - Functional literacy classes - Integration of basic skills into CETA-LEA program

relationship between the LEA and CETA. In the balance-of-state, the State Department of Education will be the liaison. Liaisons appear to be a key to the evolution of a legal or official relationship into a cooperative, mutually beneficial partnership.

Liaison Between CETA-LEA Program and Community

The development of quality work sites for a program is strongly related to activities of program staff in building good relationships with the public and private job sectors. One LEA program director in Maryland serves as a school system liaison to various business and industry groups in the community. The role has resulted in development of new work sites. The relationship of the CETA planning board, CETA youth council, and LEA and CETA staff to public and private business, industry, and labor have been key factors in development of work experience positions in all Maryland programs.

Adapting Alternative Education Models to Local Programs

Programs that have been used as models for establishing an alternative curriculum (e.g., EBCE) have been used more successfully through being adapted to local needs and participants. It has also been found that a program design should be adapted as its problems and inadequacies become apparent. Programs that have been operating successfully in Maryland appear to be those that have been modified to better serve the needs of participants. The development of a good working relationship between the LEA and CETA is very important for changes in the program design that are based upon results. The characteristics of youth being served and the lack of a definitive model for improving the transition from school to work require that programs be flexible and open to adaptation.

Program Coordination Within Schools

The experience of each of the LEA-CETA programs in the traditional schools has demonstrated that a staff person (teacher, counselor, liaison) should be placed in each participating school. Regular LEA or CETA staff tend to have other responsibilities and cannot handle the day-to-day needs

of program participants. These school staff can also serve as work site monitors and are valuable links between the in-class activities and the work experience component.

Support from Local Governments

Local government support has been an important factor in establishing CETA-LEA relationships in all of the Maryland programs. In those local situations where official government hierarchies and organizational communications are less necessary for program operation, the LEA and CETA staff cooperate more fully in program design and development.

Hiring Program Staff

The involvement of both LEA and CETA in hiring program staff provides each organization more assurance that their objectives will be accomplished and that their policies will be followed.

LEA/CETA In-Service Staff Meetings

In-service meetings with LEA faculty and staff help to familiarize educators with the program and the role of CETA staff. Such meetings have been very useful in gaining program support and avoiding problems.

LEA/CETA Program Administrators' Meetings

Frequent meetings between LEA and CETA program administrators and with YETP staff is important for evolution and changes in the program that will improve services. The meetings also improve mutual understanding of each organization's perspectives and of the orientations of key individuals.

ACTIONS TO IMPROVE DESIGN AND DELIVERY

Based on the experiences of the Maryland programs, a number of actions that local LEA-CETA program administrators could take to improve the design and delivery of services were suggested. Several of these suggested actions are related to the awarding of academic credit. Some of the following actions are either currently being implemented in Maryland programs, or they are extensions of current practices.

- Transition services that can be delivered on a short-term basis should be increased, e.g., for one academic quarter or following graduation.

- Work experience should be provided within a comprehensive program of employability skills training. For some students, work experience alone does not provide job readiness.

- Participants need supervision by youth program staff while in work experience. A staff person should be located in each school in which the program is operated.

- Follow-up with participants is necessary after program completion, after termination from the program, and following high school graduation.

- The number of participants drawn from each school in the program should be maximized to alleviate problems of coordination of services, transportation, and use of program staff.

- Local programs need better methods of assessing and evaluating program outcomes.

- Local school administrators and CETA staff should work together to resolve the funding cycle problem. Schools should attempt to lend as much stability to the program as possible within the constraints that the timing of CETA funding imposes.

- Local school systems could work with prime sponsors to develop a policy that would allow learning experiences gained in CETA-supported alternative schools or basic skills classes to be transferred for credit to the school system. Development of such a policy may require assistance from State department officials who would need to advise local school boards on their responsibilities in this type of arrangement. The school system would thus be able to assist in providing education to youth who have not been served by traditional schools, and at the same time provide a means of reintegrating these youth into an educational system.

VII

STATE ACTIONS

With the passage of the Youth Employment Act, the State Superintendent of Schools, with the endorsement and support of the State Board of Education, acted to ensure the involvement of the State Department of Education and the State's LEAs in implementation. The actions taken included the convening of a meeting of the State's LEAs and prime sponsors in cooperation with the State Manpower Planning Office which addressed the act and its implementation. In addition, a State Department of Education technical assistance team was formed to provide help to LEAs and prime sponsors in planning and carrying out the provisions of the act.

This State Department of Education leadership posture, the active involvement of several of the Department's key personnel, and the framework of supportive policies have generally encouraged the awarding of academic credit for work experience. In addition, the following programs have been started which will provide LEAs and prime sponsors with additional tools or delivery mechanisms for awarding credit for work experience:

- The State Board of Education has approved an external diploma program and the State Department of Education has employed a staff specialist to carry out the program.
- The State Manpower Planning Office has awarded the State Department of Education a contract which will provide a vocational counselor-CETA liaison person in each of the balance-of-state LEAs.
- The State Department of Education has operated, for the second year, an Experience Based Career Education program with training tailored to meet CETA program needs.
- Under State Department of Education leadership, five LEAs have planned and are operating school-community multi-service centers. These centers provide a variety of programs and services, many of which relate directly to the needs of CETA clients.

While the State Department of Education has provided visible leadership and assistance, there is a need for additional support and service. Local and CETA staff have indicated that the primary action the State Department of Education can take in assisting the process of awarding academic credit is to provide an intermediary, or interpreter, between CETA prime sponsors and school districts. Local educators need to know what can be offered under

CETA youth programs, but they also need to obtain the information in terms familiar to them. The State Department of Education can provide assistance to local school systems on possible program designs for which academic credit can be awarded and suggest means of implementing and improving CETA programs. Local school staff have not expressed a need for changes in State policy with regard to academic credit. However, both LEA and CETA staff indicated a need to be informed on how State policy with regard to graduation requirements could be interpreted to include the types of experiences and services offered under YEDPA. Generally, local program administrators would like to have local school boards given the flexibility to set policy on academic credit, but they indicate that the State could assist them with a set of guidelines or examples of how academic credit in CETA-LEA programs would fit State and local policies.

A significant problem for program implementation in schools is the timing of annual CETA funding. The State Department of Education could initiate research analysis of procedures for overcoming this problem. Technical assistance based on this research would help local school administrators devise ways of enrolling students in CETA programs and awarding academic credit for the programs within the normal school year.

APPENDICES

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION MATERIALS AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES DATA

APPENDIX A

CITY CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS

CETA EMPLOYEE PROGRESS REPORT

EMPLOYEE'S MMIS REGISTRATION NO (2) | LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE INITIAL (8)

OGRAM
D-TRACK _____ MMIS PROGRAM ID NUMBER (28)

IRKSITE _____ (35) HCL CLUSTER _____ (3

ctions: Please rate this enrollee *as if* he/she were a regular full time employee in an entry level job similar to his/her present work ynment.

CELLENT: Clearly superior to the minimum required to hold present job. Employee would definitely be given a promotion, a raise, dditional responsibility.
RY GOOD: Better than the minimum required to hold present job. Employee would likely be considered for a promotion, a raise, dditional responsibility.
OD: Employee's performance is usually acceptable, under ordinary circumstances, to retain present job.
RGINAL: Does not meet the minimum standards for present job. Precludes a promotion, a raise, or additional responsibility and ld lead to probation or mild disciplinary action.
SATISFACTORY: Seldom or never meets minimum standards for present job. Would lead to serious disciplinary action or ination.

rcle One)	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Marginal	Unsatis-factory	
ount of work completed	5	4	3	2	1	(39
owledge of Job	5	4	3	2	1	(40
rall quality of work	5	4	3	2	1	(41
lity to follow directions	5	4	3	2	1	(42
iative	5	4	3	2	1	(43
endance	5	4	3	2	1	(44
rest-motivation	5	4	3	2	1	(45
endability	5	4	3	2	1	(46
onal Appearance	5	4	3	2	1	(47
mmunication (oral, written)	5	4	3	2	1	(48
ponse to criticism	5	4	3	2	1	(49
control	5	4	3	2	1	(50
along with others	5	4	3	2	1	(5

ume for a moment that you had an open position, would you recommend this person for a permanent in your department? (Circle One)

efinitely Yes	Probably Yes	Uncertain	Probably Not	Definitely Not	
5	4	3	2	1	(5

Month Day Ye

_____ (53)
Signature of Supervisor

ments:

HARBOR CITY LEARNING PROJECT

PROJECT AREA _____

PROJECT TOPIC _____

by

_____

Harbor City Learning E.B.C.E. | PROJECT SKETCH

tudent _____ LC _____ Date _____

roject Area _____ Project Topic _____

I. WHAT GOALS ARE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THIS INVESTIGATION?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

I. WHAT RESOURCES WILL BE USED?

RP/RO/CR Address _____ Phone _____

RP/RO/CR Address _____ Phone _____

RP/RO/CR Address _____ Phone _____

RP/RO/CR Address _____ Phone _____

OTHER MAJOR RESOURCES (Give name of person or title of book, articles, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

II. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS NECESSARY FOR THE PROJECT

A. Prerequisites _____

_____

_____

B. Materials _____

_____

V. Approved by (student) _____

Approved by (LC) _____

·bor City Learning E.B.C.E.

PROJECT SHEET

·tudent _____ LC _____ Date _____

·roject Topic _____

·roject Goal _____

_____

_____

·roject Activity _____

Starting Date _____ Estimated Completion Date _____

ESOURCES

	Resource Name	Address	Phone	Dated Started	Date Finished	RP	RO	CF
ommunity								

n-School _____

_____

_____

_____

RODUCTS

EVALUATION

PROJECT SHEET

Project Activity _____

Starting Date _____ Estimated Completion Date _____

RESOURCES

Resource Name	Address	Phone	Date Started	Date Finished	RP	RO	CR

In-School _____

PRODUCTS	EVALUATION

Project Activity _____

Starting Date _____ Estimated Completion Date _____

RESOURCES

Resource Name	Address	Phone	Date Started	Date Finished	RP	RO	CR

In-School _____

PRODUCTS	EVALUATION

808-00647

Staff Comments

Basic Skill Emphasis

Reading_____

Math_____

Writing_____

Research_____

Subject Emphasis

Math_____

Science_____

Social Studies_____

English_____

Reading_____

APPENDIX B

COUNTY A PROGRAM

The following data reflects attendance, grades and suspension records of twenty-nine (29) junior high school students in the 1976-1977 CETA Occupational Exploration Experience Program.

They are included to give the reader another dimension of the effectiveness of the in-school youth programs.

Birthdate	75-76 First Quarter Math Grades	76-77 Math Grades	75-76 First Quarter English Grades	76-77 English Grades	75-76 Attendance (Days	76-77* Absent)	First Time Ever On Honor Roll	
1/11/62	E	D	E	C	30	10		
6/19/61	E	C	E	C	27	4		
1/30/61	C	E	E	C	74	30		
10/18/61	C	C	B	B	8	6		
11/ 9/60	E	C	E	D	9	0		
6/29/61	C	B	C	B	18	2	x	
9/21/62	C	C	B	C	13	12		
11/ 9/61	C	A	C	B	18	12	x	
1/12/61	B	C	C	B	4	-		
1/14/61	D	C	C	C	7	2		
12/ 7/63	E	C	C	C	23	10		
4/16/62	D	B	C	C	30	16		
12/24/62	D	C	E	B	11	10		
10/13/61	E	C	E	D	36	7		
3/31/62	C	C	C	A	88	11	x	
3/18/61	D	C	D	C	62	-	x	
8/25/60	C	C	C	B	21	27--serious illness 2½ w		
2/28/61	D	C	C	B	20	13		
8/15/61	E	C	D	C	20	-		
1/26/62	E	B	D	C	75	27		
6/ 7/62	C	A	B	B	27	5	x	
4/ 5/61	C	A	C	B	9	10--family death		
1/27/62	C	B	D	B	8	1	x	
9/26/61	E	C	C	B	68	5		
5/23/62	E	C	C	B	5	2		
5/14/61	C	C	B	B	24	4		
12/20/61	B	C	C	C	7	2		
4/ 6/61	A	D	E	B	27	-		
5/20/62	C	D	D	D	12	1		

The total number of suspensions within this group for the 1975-76 school year was 26. The total to date is 4.

* Year to Date

County A Program

County Public Schools

In-School Youth Employment Program

WORK EXPERIENCE TRAINING PLAN

Student Name _____ Job Title _____

Contact Person _____ Phone _____

Name and address of Training Site (Include Department and Room Number within school) _____

_____

_____

Name and Title of Site Supervisor _____

_____

On-The-Job-Work Experiences (Job Description) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name and phone number of person responsible for student's time and attendance, if other than contact person _____

_____

Student Work Hours _____

White Copy – To CETA Office
Yellow Copy – Retain

CE-022

Board of Education of [illegible] County

Date_____

COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CETA In-School Youth Employment Program

JOB READINESS ASSESSMENT
AND
EMPLOYABILITY RECOMMENDATIONS FORM

Student Name _____ Age_____

Address_____
(Street) (City/Town) (State) (Zip)

Sex_____(Optional) Race_____(Optional)

School_____ Grade_____

CETA In-School Program Career Assessment Specialist_____

I. VIESA Test Results Summary

II. Personal Interview Results: (1 high to 10 low)

A. How Realistic are Student's Job Expectations?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1(
B. Student's Level of Motivation:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1(
C. Student's Self-Perception of his/her Employability Status	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1(

D. Comments

III. A Availability of Student for full-time private sector employment after graduation (Seniors Only)

A. Transportation Plan Development Yes____ No____

B. Willingness to Pursue Needed Training Yes____ No____

C. Obstacles (specify):

III. B Job Readiness Assessment Statement (Based on VIESA Test Results, Actual Work-Experience Evaluation, and Personal Interview Responses):

VI. Employability Plan Recommendations:

A. Most Appropriate Occupational Setting for Student (Based on Personal Inrer-view Responses):

B. Types of Jobs/Careers that Would Best Fit the Student (Based on VIESA Assess-ment Results):

C. Recommendations for Placement (Summer placement or full-time placement after graduation):

D. Course areas related to and recommended for jobs selected via VIESA Assessment

Original - CETA In-School Office
Copy - Student's School based file

INST - CE - #001 4/78 Revised (8/78)

COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
IN-SCHOOL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

EMPLOYER'S RATING FORM

Student_____ Agency Name_____

School_____ CETA Teacher_____

Please rate your employee in each of the following areas by using a check (✓). This form will be used to assist the CETA teacher in determining a work experience grade for the student. This form is to be submitted once a month with the last payroll in the month.

	Out-standing	Very Good	Good	Needs Improvement	Unsatis-factory
Attendance					
Punctuality					
Constructive use of working time					
Ability to follow instructions					
Initiative/seeks help when needed					
Cooperativeness					
Completion of assigned task					
Attitude					
Dependability					
Personal appearance					
Quantity of work					
Quality of work					

Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

What is your overall evaluation of this student? (Check one)

___Outstanding(A) ___Very Good(B) ___Good(C) ___Needs Improvement(D) ___Unsatisfactory(E)

_____
Signature of Immediate Supervisor/Date

(Supervisor discusses form with student and gives student pink copy)

Distribution:
White Copy-CETA Office
Yellow Copy-Immediate Supervisor
Pink Copy-Student

In-School Youth Employment Program

Jr. High & Special Centers

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

STUDENT NAME: _____ PAY PERIOD: _____

School/Job Site _____ Date _____

Job Site Supervisors are to submit this evaluation form to the contact person every two weeks with the payroll. Please check (x) the appropriate level of functioning.

	Very Good	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
A - Accuracy				
B - Alertness				
C - Initative/Interest in work				
D - Appearance				
E - Attitude toward Job				
F - Personality				
G - Cooperation (w/peers and superiors)				
H - Attendance/Punctuality				

COMMENTS:

_____

Grade for (two-week) period

_____

Supervisor Signature

White copy to CETA office - Retain Yellow Copy

APPENDIX C

COUNTY B PROGRAM

County B Program

SUMMARY YOUTH CHARACTERISTICS

				Total
1. Sex:	Male			33
	Female			62
2. Age:	16 years			55
	17 years			40
3. Education:	High School student			89
	High School completed			4
	G.E.D. this summer			2
	High School drop out			0
4. Family Income:	AFDC and/or other public assistance			15
	Economically disadvantaged			56
	85% or 70% lower living standard			39
5. Family Status:	Family head			2
	Family member			87
	Unrelated individual (group home)			6
6. Ethnic Group:		M	F	
	Black	15	45	60
	White	11	11	22
	American Indian	0	0	0
	Oriental	0	2	2
	Spanish American	2	2	4
	Other	2	5	7
7. Juvenile Offenders:	At enrollment	2	0	2
	During project	1	1	2
8. Students in Non-Traditional Sex Roles:				11
	Training Courses	2	5	7
	OJT work experience	4	0	4

Program Follow-Up (September 25, 1978)

				Total
1. Return to school		36	49	85
Dropped out of school		1	0	1
Information not available		7	2	9
2. School Program				
Academic		22	15	37
General/Business		0	16	16
Vocational		14	9	23
Work Study/Experience		5	3	8
Information not available		3	8	11
Relevant program change		2	3	5
3. Enrolled in next level of Training Course		0	10	10
Office Occupations Lab.		0	7	7
Power Mechanics		0	3	3
4. Employment Program				
Summer Employment Terminated	8/25	14	4	18
School Program Conflict	9/4	1	2	3
Enrolled in College	9/4	1	0	1
Still Employed	9/25	5	6	11
Fired	8/18	1	0	1

FINAL REPORT CARD (GRADE) DISTRIBUTION

Project JOBS

Grade	Career Awareness Number	Career Awareness Percent	Training Courses Number	Training Courses Percent
A	12	13.3	14	15.5
B	25	27.7	13	14.4
C	20	22.2	7	7.7
D	8	8.8	1	1.1
F	2	2.2	0	0
LC	9	10.0	10	11.1

Withdrawn - 14 - 15.5%

OJT Work experience
P - 25 - 27.7%
F - 6 - 6.6% (Fired)

Grade	Career Awareness Number	Career Awareness Percent	Training Courses Number	Training Courses Percent
A	3	7.5	3	7.5
B	5	12.5	0	0
C	10	25.0	2	5.0
D	3	7.5	1	2.5
F	0	0	0	0
LC	8	20.0	5	12.5

Withdrawn - 11 - 27.5%

OJT Work experience
P - 13 - 32.5%
F - 5 - 12.5% (Fired)

Grade	Career Awareness Number	Career Awareness Percent	Training Courses Number	Training Courses Percent
A	9	18.0	11	22.0
B	20	40.0	13	26.0
C	10	20.0	5	10.0
D	5	10.0	0	0
F	2	4.0	0	0
LC	1	2.0	5	10.0

Withdrawn - 3 - 6%

OJT Work experience
P - 12 - 24%
F - 1 - 2% (Fired)

ON THE JOB TRAINING CONTRACT

CONTRACT NO. _____

The following agreement to be effective _____ through _____, is hereby entered into by the County Public Schools, Project JOBS, hereafter called MCPS and _____ _____ a profit organization, hereinafter called the contractor.

I. MCPS shall:

- test and certify eligible applicants for trainee positions
- provide orientation for trainees
- provide orientation for contractor
- provide vocational, academic and job counseling to trainee
- compensate contractor for hours spent in supervision and training not to exceed $_____
- apprise trainee of conditions of this contract
- terminate this contract prior to June 15, 1979 only for cause agreed upon in this contract (Section VII), subject to the following exception:
  a) the completion of 140 hours of on-the-job-training.
- visit work site bi-weekly and participate with contractor and trainee in a mutually arranged evaluation conference

II. The contractor shall:

- provide employment for each trainee for _____ hours per week for duration of contract
- provide extraordinary supervision and training for each trainee for _____ hours per week for duration of contract

II. (continued)

- review and evaluate trainee job performance based on predetermined standards bi-weekly and participate with MCPS representative and trainee in a mutually arranged evaluation conference
- apprise trainee of conditions of this contract
- consider OJT worker a regular employee subject to standard personnel rules and regulations, wages and fringe benefits at the same level, and to the same extent as other employees in the employment situation; and to working conditions and promotional opportunities neither more nor less than such other employees similarly employed
- terminate this contract prior to June 15, 1979 only for cause agreed upon in this contract (Section VII), subject to the following exception:

  a) the completion of 140 hours of on-the-job training
- employ trainee in a part-time position at the end of the contract period providing that the trainee reaches performance standards described herein as training objectives

III. On the Job Training Outline:

Time Schedule	Training Objectives

IV. Contractor Information

Business Name: _____

Business Address: _____

Business Phone: _____

OJT Supervisor: _____

OJT Position Title: _____

OJT Salary: _____

V. Project JOBS Information

Contact: _____

Address: Project JOBS, 10830 Eastwood Avenue, _____

Phone: 593-2876

For Billing: _____

VI. Method of Compensation

Compensation shall be made according to a formula agreed upon by MCPS and contractor (see addendum). Compensation to the contractor for time will be made upon receipt of a voucher documenting extraordinary supervision and training hours spent specifically with the trainee. Such vouchers shall be submitted to , Project Coordinator, on April 25, 1979, and June 20, 1979. MCPS shall be reimbursed for all monies paid to contractor in the event that the contractor terminates the trainee without due cause. Contractor shall be reimbursed for extraordinary supervision/training time only for that time that the trainee is actually on the job.

VII. Conditions of Terminations:

Due cause for termination of this contract is defined as follows:

1. MCPS does not adhere to the terms and conditions written in this contract and the contractor terminates the contract.
2. The contractor does not adhere to the terms and conditions written in this contract and MCPS terminates the contract.
3. The trainee does not follow the contractor's personnel rules and employee regulations and the contractor terminates the contract.
4. The trainee does not meet/reach skill and performance levels necessary for adequate job perforamnce as stipulated in this contract. Trainee and MCPS must be given notice of such assessment and the trainee must be given a 2-week probationary period in which to improve. At the end of the 2-week period the trainee must be reassessed and either kept in his/her OJT slot or terminated.
5. The trainee refuses to continue in the program or is terminated with due cause by MCPS, the contractor shall be notified immediately and the contract terminated upon notification.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved by signature.

_____

Director of Career and Vocational Education
County Public Schools

_____

Contractor

Compensation to Contractor

OJT Contract Number _____

Contractor's Name and Address

_____

_____

_____

A. Hours of employment per week . . . . . _____

B. OJT Salary . . . . . _____

C. Hours of extraordinary training and supervision per week . . . . _____

D. Hourly wage of trainee's supervisor . . . . . _____

E. Percentage of Line D to be reimbursed . . . . . _____

WEEK	Extraordinary Supervision and Training Hours		Supervisor's Salary		Total Compensation Per Week
1		X		=	
2		X		=	
3		X		=	
4		X		=	
5		X		=	
6		X		=	
7		X		=	
8		X		=	
9		X		=	
10		X		=	
11		X		=	
12		X		=	
13		X		=	
14		X		=	

AMOUNT OF TOTAL COMPENSATION _____